

REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Claims 1 and 3 are allowed.

Applicant's arguments appearing in the first full paragraph on page 3 of the remarks accompanying the request for reconsideration filed on March 31, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner maintains that the element 34 in Houtz can be broadly construed as being a spring inasmuch as the element 34 is likely formed of metal, which is capable of deflecting when subjected to a load below the elastic limit of the metal, and which returns to the original dimension when the load is removed.

Applicant's arguments appearing in the last paragraph on page 3 through the first two full paragraphs on page 4 of the remarks accompanying the request for reconsideration filed on March 31, 2009, with respect to the distinction between the location of the pressure reducing valve as recited in each of the presently pending claims 1 and 3, and the location of the valve 38 in Houtz, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 3 as being anticipated by Houtz has been withdrawn.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

None of the prior art discloses or renders obvious a control device for an input clutch of a work vehicle including the draining oil passage and pressure reducing valve arranged together with the remainder of the structure as specified in each of claims 1 and 3, and particularly wherein the pressure reducing valve is disposed in the draining